

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action states that claims 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended the independent claims to include the subject matter of claim 7, therefore rendering the claims 1 and 13 patentable as well as the claims dependent therefrom.

#### **Objection to Claim 13**

The Office Action objects to claim 13 because of informalities. Applicants have amended claim 13 to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claim 13.

#### **Rejection of Claims 13-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapados et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,869) ("Chapados et al."). Applicants traverse this rejection and reserve the right to argue that claims 13-20 are not obvious in view of Chapados et al. However, to further prosecution, Applicants have incorporated the limitation of claim 7 into claim 13. Applicants know that they have essentially swapped limitations of the top level flow controller being a finite state model with the limitation of claim 7 that requires the top level flow controller to be a recursive transition network (RTN) flow controller. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 13-20 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

**Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapados et al. in view of Abella et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0105634) ("Abella et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and do not acquiesce that it would be obvious for one of skill in the art to combine Chapados et al. with Abella et al. However, while reserving all available arguments, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the top level flow controller is a recursive transition network (RTN) flow controller.


As noted in the final Office Action, this feature is patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-6 and 12 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2008

By: 

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino  
Reg. No. 33,444  
AT&T Corp.  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,166  
Phone: 410-286-9405  
Fax No.: 410-510-1433